



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,222	04/28/2000	Paul Haeberli	11087-014001	3668
31688	7590	08/04/2004	EXAMINER	
TRAN & ASSOCIATES 6768 MEADOW VISTA CT. SAN JOSE, CA 95135			FADOK, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/560,222

Applicant(s)

HAEBERLI, PAUL

Examiner

Mark Fadok

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 112-136 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 112-136 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3625

**DETAILED ACTION*****Response to Amendment***

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 10/23/2003. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment to claim 112, leaving claims 112-136 as pending in the application. The amendment and arguments have been carefully considered and were found to be persuasive, however after further review a new grounds of rejection based on the amendment is provided below:

***Official Notice of features in claims 155 and 117-135***

A "traverse" is a denial of an opposing party's allegations of fact. The Examiner respectfully submits that applicants' arguments and comments do not appear to traverse what Examiner regards as knowledge that would have been generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Even if one were to interpret applicants' arguments and comments as constituting a traverse, applicants' arguments and comments do not appear to constitute an adequate traverse because applicant has not specifically pointed out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. 27 CFR 1.104(d)(2), MPEP 707.07(a). An adequate traverse must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying

Art Unit: 3625

Examiner's notice of what is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 728, 169 USPQ 231, 234 (CCPA1971).

If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well-known statement during examination, then the object of the well-known statement is taken to be admitted prior art. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim one line 7 has the word "mage-based" should be "image-based".  
Appropriate action is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 112-135 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garfinkle and further in view of Official Notice.**

**In regards to claim 112**, Garfinkle discloses receiving a first image from a user (FIG 3);

Art Unit: 3625

receiving a request for a demonstration of an image-based product by the user (FIG 5B);

Garfinkle teaches processing digital photos along with delivering and storing digital image products on a server for a customer to upload and download images to a client computer for modification of attributes of the digital image from a client computer (col 7, lines 4-42) and plurality of products (thumbnails, gifts, col 7, lines 53-60), but does not specifically mention that the attributes are automatically selected and presented to the user. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include in Garfinkle, automatically demonstrating a product with modifications available, since it has been held that broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity, which has accomplished the same result, involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192. Garfinkle would have been motivated to incorporate the demonstration of a product, because this is a notoriously well known method for showing a product for sale that is modified from its original presentation; for example, showing the tee shirt or mug of Garfinkle with the image shown on it provides for an excellent way for people to visualize the product and thus increase the likelihood of a sale.

Applicant may argue that the manipulation of the product attributes occurs not on the server, but at the client computer. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to (describe modification), since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

**In regards to claim 113**, Garfinkle teaches displaying the first preview image of the image-based product (col 7, lines 5-40).

**In regards to claim 114**, Garfinkle teaches wherein displaying the first preview image of the image-based product includes:

downloading the first preview image to a client computer; and displaying the first preview image in the client computer (col 7, lines 5-40).

**In regards to claim 115**, Garfinkle teaches uploading the first image from a client computer to a server using a computer network (FIG 1).

**In regards to claim 116**, Garfinkle teaches receiving a selection of the first image from a plurality of images (FIG 5B)

**In regards to claims 117-135**, the features claimed are old and well known in digital image processing software and are notoriously well known in photo processing software such as Adobe Photoshop (see Garfinkle col 7). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include in Garfinkle, the myriad of functional features of the instant claims along with others available in the art at the time of the invention, because this would provide the user increased functionality and cause more users to use the site to attain these functionalities, thus increasing sales.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 112-136 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **(703) 605-4252**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Vincent Millin** can be reached on **(703) 308-1065**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Receptionist** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-1113**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner for Patents***

***P.O. Box 1450***

***Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450***

or faxed to:

**(703) 872-9306** [Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

Art Unit: 3625

**(703) 746-7206** [Informal/Draft communications, labeled

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451

Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Fadok', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark Fadok

Patent Examiner